

Application No.: 10/698201

Case No.: 58836US003

REMARKS**Amendment**

The specification has been amended to correct a typographical error. The word "lest" has been replaced with the word "least." No new matter has been added.

Restriction Requirement

Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 1-19 were restricted under 35 USC § 121 as follows:

- I. Claims 1-15 are said to be drawn to a method of preparing a pressure-sensitive adhesive, classified in Class 427, subclass 207.1;
- II. Claims 16-18 are said to be drawn to a radiation-curable precursor, classified in Class 520, subclass 1; and
- III. Claim 19 is said to be drawn to a pressure-sensitive adhesive tape, classified in Class 428, subclass 411.1.

In response, Applicants elect Group I, with traverse. Reconsideration and withdrawal or modification of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

In Group I, Applicants broadly claim methods of preparing a pressure sensitive adhesive. Each of these method claims includes the formation of a radiation curable precursor. In Group II, Applicants broadly claim such radiation curable precursors. Applicants submit that the claims of Groups I and II are so interrelated that a search of one group of claims will reveal art to the other. Moreover, the classification of Groups I and II claims in different classes and subclasses is not necessarily sufficient grounds to require restriction.

Were restriction to be effected between the claims in Groups I and II, a separate examination of the claims in Groups I and II would require substantial duplication of work on the part of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Even though some additional consideration would be necessary, the scope of analysis of novelty of all the claims of Groups I and II, would have to be as rigorous as when only the claims of Group I were being considered by themselves. Clearly, this duplication of effort is not warranted where these claims are so interrelated. Further,

Application No.: 10/698201

Case No.: 58836US003

Applicants submit that restriction between the claims in Groups I and II would place an undue burden by requiring payment of a separate filing fee for examination of the nonelected claims, as well as the added costs associated with prosecuting and maintaining multiple patents.

In Group III, Applicants claim an article obtained by the methods of Group I. Applicants submit that the claims of Groups I and II are so interrelated that a search of one group of claims will reveal art to the other. In addition, restriction between, and a separate examination of the claims in Groups I and III would require substantial duplication of work on the part of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Further, it would place an undue burden by requiring payment of a separate filing fee for examination of the nonelected claims, as well as the added costs associated with prosecuting and maintaining multiple patents.

Conclusion

Applicants have elected Group I, with traverse. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal or modification of the restriction requirement. In addition, continued prosecution of this application is respectfully requested.

February 20, 2006
Date

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Scott A. Bardell, Reg. No.: 39,594
Telephone No.: 651-736-6935

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833

SAB/TMS/jt